



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

A

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/858,323	05/15/2001	Peder J. Jungck	10736/7	3087
757	7590	12/08/2005	EXAMINER	
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE P.O. BOX 10395 CHICAGO, IL 60610			CHOWDHURY, AZIZUL Q	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2145		
DATE MAILED: 12/08/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/858,323	JUNGCK ET AL.
	Examiner Azizul Choudhury	Art Unit 2145

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Azizul Choudhury. (3) Jim Katz.
 (2) Patrice Winder. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 December 2005.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.

If Yes, brief description: Agenda along with figure 9 of the application, highlighting the data path.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Dally (US Pat No: 6285679).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



Jason Carbone
SPE AV2145

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative explained how the claim language focused on describing the architecture of the design, due to the nature of the invention. In particular, the applicant's representative explained how data was transferred from one set of processors to two other sets of processors. He submitted a copy of figure 9 displaying a highlighted path of the data flow within the claimed invention's architecture. The examiners recommended making amendments to better illustrate the highlighted path of figure 9. No agreement has been reached.

Our Case No. 10736/7**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:)
 Peder J. Jungck, et al.)
 Serial No.: 09/858,323) Examiner: Azizul Q. Choudhury
 Filing Date: May 15, 2001) Group Art Unit No.: 2145
 For: EDGE ADAPTER ARCHITECTURE)
 APPARATUS AND METHOD)

PROPOSED INTERVIEW AGENDA

With regard to the outstanding Final Office Action of October 18, 2005, I would like to hold an interview with Examiner Choudhury and Primary Examiner Patrice Winder. My goal in conducting this interview is to understand the nature of Examiner Choudhury and Primary Examiner Winder's positions with respect to the patentability of the subject claims and advance prosecution of the above captioned application.

The proposed agenda for this interview is as follows:

- A. Discuss the logical design of the claimed packet interception and processing architecture (with reference to Attachment 2);
- B. Contrast the logical design from physical implementations of the claimed architecture;
- C. Discuss the logical design as claimed in independent claim 1 (Attachment 1) with an emphasis on the individual elements as well as the overall claimed combination;
- D. Discuss the patentability of the architecture as claimed in light of Examiner Choudhury and Primary Examiner Winder's concerns; and
- E. Propose alternative claim amendments which may clarify the claimed subject matter.

ATTACHMENT 1

1. (Previously Presented) An architecture for intercepting and processing packets transmitted from a source to a destination over a network, the architecture comprising:
 - a packet interceptor coupled with said network and operative to selectively intercept said packets prior to receipt by said destination based on a first criteria;
 - at least one primary processor coupled with said packet interceptor and operative to perform stateless processing tasks on said intercepted packets, said stateless processing tasks comprising tasks which are not directly dependent on a previously intercepted packet, said at least one primary processor including:
 - at least two stateless packet processors coupled in parallel, said processing of said intercepted packets being distributed among said at least two stateless packet processors;
 - at least one secondary processor coupled with said at least one primary processor and operative to perform stateful processing tasks on said intercepted packets, said stateful processing tasks comprising tasks which are based at least on a previously intercepted packet, said at least one secondary processor including:
 - at least two stateful packet processors coupled in series with each other, each of said at least two stateful packet processors operative to perform a portion of said stateful processing tasks on said intercepted packets, a last one in said series of said at least two stateful packet processors being coupled with said network and operative to selectively release said intercepted packet back to said network.

ATTACHMENT 2

Patent Application Publication May 30, 2002 Sheet 9 of 9 US 2002/0065938 A1

FIG. 9

